

LECTURE I
 INTRODUCTION: SOURCES AND
 PRINCIPLES. STUARTS AND
 GEORGIANS TO 1799

If one reads the typescript or printed texts of past Sandars lectures, one finds that there are, broadly speaking, two ways in which successive Readers have opened their first lecture. Some have plunged boldly into their subject with complete detachment. Others—the majority, I think—have gradually established a twofold tradition. First, they have usually referred, sometimes with genuine embarrassment, sometimes with mock diffidence, to those who have preceded them in their chosen field. Second, they have usually declared the relevance of their subject to the terms of the Sandars bequest.

I must confess that I am by nature and habit one who respects a tradition. But on this occasion I am perhaps also fortunate in not having the shadow of any eminent predecessor looking, as it were, over my shoulder: for this is the first time since the inauguration of the Readership in 1895 that the invitation has been extended to one whose particular interest lies in the field of music. I am therefore deeply conscious of the signal honour I have received by my election.

The terms of the Sandars bequest are encouragingly wide. They require that ‘the lecture is to embrace the subject of bibliography, palaeography, typography, bookbinding, book illustration, the science of books and manuscripts, and the arts relating thereto’, but, further, that—subject to the discretion of the electors—the lectures are to be ‘based upon and illustrated by examples contained in the University or college libraries’. I can only regret that within my own University I have had to ask for exemption from the requirement of drawing my examples solely from Cambridge libraries. But you may find some compensation in the fact that, in sum of excellence,

Some British Collectors of Music

variety and numbers, the music-collectors whose treasures have enriched Cambridge are hardly rivalled elsewhere, even though priority of collecting must be ceded to another university.

I realise that the topic I have chosen cannot of itself lay claim to originality, although I believe that the way I propose to develop it has not been explored before. It was Barclay Squire, the pioneer in this as in so many other fields of musical bibliography, who first assembled information about a few private collectors of music in Great Britain. His knowledge was committed to print as part of the article on musical libraries in the first and second editions of Grove's *Dictionary of Music*; in the third and fourth editions it was expanded by C. B. Oldman, and in the fifth it was remoulded by Charles Cudworth on even more generous lines than before. My debt to this article will be obvious, and in general I do not propose to repeat the details of collections given in it. But I shall take the subject a good deal farther afield, and for this my inspiration is partly due to another article in Grove, compiled by Otto Erich Deutsch, and headed, somewhat curiously, 'Collections, private'.

This article has, I think, some link with Cambridge, for it originated in the association between Deutsch and Paul Hirsch, which dated from about 1940 onwards. At their almost daily meetings, either in the University Library, or at a certain café in Trinity Street, these two bibliographers covered an inexhaustible range of musical topics, such as editions, issues, states, plate-numbers, *passe-partout* titles, publishers' catalogues, and, of course, libraries and collectors. One of the reference books they used when discussing collectors was the *List of Catalogues of English Book Sales, 1676–1900, now in the British Museum* (London, 1915). Among those who shared in their discussions from time to time was D. R. Wakeling, then a First Assistant in Cambridge University Library, where he was in charge of the Music Room. Wakeling undertook the labour of reading right through the 447 pages of the *List*, and made an abstract in typescript of all entries relating to music. (Copies of this abstract are now in the British Museum, and in Cambridge University Library, from which Wakeling retired in 1950.) This

Stuarts and Georgians to 1799

invaluable piece of work served as the basis for Deutsch's article 'Collections, private', in which he carried the terminal date, from his own researches, up to 1950. Deutsch included a number of early sales of which no catalogue is now extant; he also listed some other collections, preserved more or less intact by bequest and other means. Here I must state the crucial question that posed itself when I was planning these lectures. Should I deal with only fifty or so of the great collectors, treating each at considerable length? Or should I mention many more—three or four times as many, perhaps—giving due attention to the famous, but for the lesser mentioning only their general character and a few items of outstanding interest?

I chose the latter course, because it would bring to light the maximum of new facts and information. As nothing, apart from a few very incomplete lists and summaries, has been written about music-collectors, this was the deciding factor. Given this decision (which I hope will commend itself to my readers), Wakeling's abstract proved as invaluable to me as it had been to Deutsch. It was the springboard, as it were, from which I plunged into the deep end of the Museum's collection of catalogues. This proved to be not quite such a big task as it might seem, for statistical reasons.

Wakeling's total is 337, of which 213 are auctions of music and musical literature assembled by men—and a few women—named on the title-pages of the catalogues. There are, besides, thirty-one collections described as the property of 'a collector', 'an amateur', 'a distinguished professor' and the like. (Twenty more are found elsewhere.) Lastly, Wakeling listed ninety-three sales of two kinds of musical property, first, the stock of music publishers—multiple copies, plates, copyrights, and so on—and secondly, the stock of a few music dealers such as Calkin & Budd. I have ignored these sale-catalogues of property, not because they are to be despised, but because they have nothing to do with the collector proper. In their own right, however, they would form the subject of a new and certainly rewarding bibliographical study.

While I have examined some of the catalogues of anonymous sales—in connection with prices—I shall not consider them in detail. For my general

Some British Collectors of Music

purpose, they lack the interest of association with a person who may have had some position or distinction in the world of music. But in passing I may say that some of these anonymous ‘amateur’ or ‘professorial’ collections show such an outstanding breadth of taste and interest that it would be well worth while to undertake research to try to identify their owners. From 1900—the date at which Wakeling’s abstract ends—up to 1960, the number of important collectors whose music was sold in part or whole is twenty-five. Besides the sale-catalogues in the British Museum, there are also a few in other public and private libraries. These bring to just over 230 the total of named collections proper which were auctioned or otherwise dispersed. Excepting some in America, I have scrutinised all these catalogues. Various others, mostly early, are known to have existed, but no copies can now be traced. Fortunately, the contents of several are summarised in contemporary sources.

But sale-catalogues are by no means the only source of information, although they are by far the largest one. A few other collectors are known from manuscript or printed catalogues, and from references in periodicals, etc., though the music has mostly long since been dispersed. Others, again, to a total of over fifty scattered over the last three-and-a-half centuries, have given, bequeathed or sold their collections in part or whole to learned institutions.

In the period up to about 1830, I shall mention all collectors whose libraries are more or less fully known. After that date the great increase in the number compels me to treat them selectively. I shall allude briefly to those collections which have been preserved by gift, bequest or purchase, especially when a catalogue or fairly detailed description exists in print. But I may enlarge on the character or significance of certain collectors, if either seems not to have been fully appreciated.

I propose to exclude royal collectors of music, because I have described them elsewhere.¹ Even without them my final total amounts to over 190

¹ ‘The Royal Music Library’, *The Book Collector* (Autumn, 1958), vol. VII, no. 3, pp. 241–52. Reprinted as Appendix A 1, below, p. 103.

Stuarts and Georgians to 1799

names, which must be presented in a systematic order, particularly because I have interpreted ‘music’ in the widest possible sense, to include not solely *musica practica*, but also theory, literature and association items. One possible basis of arrangement would have been the *floruit* of the collector, but this is a point not always easy to determine. Another, though more arbitrary, method could have been a grouping by period and type. On balance, it proved best to observe one simple chronological order, based as far as possible on the date of sale, gift or bequest. An auction by no means always takes place at decease: it may be held either in the collector’s lifetime, or many years after his death. The exceptions I have had to make to the chronological principle, chiefly in the twentieth century, are not many and are easily explained by the circumstances.

Even this survey, wide as it may seem, does not present the full tale of British collectors. For there were others, besides those known from all the sources I have described, who formed collections, some probably, and others certainly, of very great historical interest. Some came under the hammer, but no copy of the catalogue survives, and it is known only from casual mention by a later collector or by an auctioneer. There were others, again, whose music does not seem to have been auctioned, but simply melted away. Yet they all contributed to the great river of music-collecting which swelled to a flood in the later nineteenth century. I shall mention a few of the earliest of these ghostly collectors in their chronological place. The rest of these sad phantoms, some thirty in all, I shall try to array before you in my last lecture, in which I shall also say something about prices as they have fluctuated during the last 150 years or so.

This, then, is the picture in its broader features. Those who have preceded me in this field have constructed the outline of the map. These lectures are, so to speak, a survey which will fill in more details. We know the location of most of the larger cities, but the map gives little idea of their size, still less of the position of smaller towns or of the direction of the roads and rivers which link one to another. Perhaps our survey may supply some of these details; it may even help to enlarge the scale of the map. It will certainly

Some British Collectors of Music

add to it the line of some of the hills and valleys that diversify this absorbingly interesting terrain.

I have paid tribute to some of the early ‘musico-cartographers’ (if I may coin the word), especially to those who worked in Cambridge. I must also mention the men who blazed many of the trails for them—the auctioneers. I do not know how much those of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries really knew about music. But they carried out the difficult task of cataloguing conscientiously, and usually very intelligently. There are few lapses of the kind perpetrated by a Puttick cataloguer who described lot 178 in the Gwilt sale of 1856 as ‘Sextus and other Ancient and Miscellaneous Music’. The auctioneers were often bound to compress a quantity of symphonies or concertos into a single lot, which thus became a much larger unit than a lot in the average eighteenth- or nineteenth-century book-sale. Hence the total number of lots may often represent only a fraction of the real size of a musical collection. But these auctioneers frequently showed a flair for music that was unusual, early, or important in other ways, and they would single it out for special mention.

Many of the catalogues of White or Musgrave and the early ones of Puttick & Simpson are notable for their intelligent and rational grouping of lots by classes. This is much more helpful than the later practice of lumping everything together in one alphabetical sequence largely governed by the arbitrary prominence given to one item in a lot. Sometimes, however, the auctioneer disappoints, when he fails to catalogue an important collection as a separate whole, but jumbles it up with ‘other properties’. This befell, amongst others, the Moscheles Collection, sold in 1847; and no one can now reconstruct its full extent and splendour. So, too, with some of James Hook’s music, sold in 1874 long after his death. Therefore I have regretfully omitted from my survey all but a bare mention of these two collectors and of others who were similarly treated. Thus the auctioneers remain—if I may change my metaphor once more—in the wings, but they should not be forgotten when the actors in this pageant of three-and-a-half centuries begin to move across the stage, as it is now high time for them to do.

Stuarts and Georgians to 1799

Who, then, was the first British collector of music? The answer to this question must depend on what, in this context, we mean by a collector. We cannot, I think, call a man a collector just because he may amass the music of his own country and his own day for performance either by himself or by others. Were this so, any English royal person, nobleman, or country gentleman who ever maintained a musical establishment would, *ipso facto*, qualify as a collector.

For a man to be estimated a true collector, we surely require evidence of something wider and deeper, something which denotes a breadth of outlook, a certain spirit of curiosity and a quest for knowledge of the musical past. For these qualities combine to reach beyond the mere reading of the notes for performance. They are often found linked to the study of musical theory and history. To some extent, taste and connoisseurship may inspire the collecting of music, but, as far as I know, in no way as intensively as they have influenced collectors of books. At the risk of making an obvious statement, I would add that the collector must have a real, personal interest in music. I must therefore exclude such eminent bibliophiles as Lumley, Cotton, Harley, Heber, Huth and Grenville. None of them had any personal interest in music or knowledge of it: they seem to have acquired it either incidentally, or simply for the sake of having the subject represented on their shelves.

The point at which music-collecting began cannot, I think, be defined precisely. It must clearly have depended on the time by which enough music had accumulated, in manuscript or print, to be collected; this factor has naturally varied in different countries. I would hazard a guess that the opportunity to collect came later in Britain than on the Continent, where certainly it was established early in the sixteenth century, if not before. Of course, the historical approach is something that could only develop as musical history developed, and clearly much early collecting, in any country, was of necessity contemporary, or nearly so.

Thus we can begin in the reign of Queen Elizabeth I, for the first man I have found who showed most of the essential qualities of a collector

Some British Collectors of Music

was William Heather. He was born *c.* 1563 and died at Oxford in 1627, having founded the Chair of Music that bears his name, and having bequeathed his books to the Music School. A list of them, probably written soon after the bequest,¹ is headed thus: ‘A Catalogue of so many setts of bookes as were given by M^r Doctor Heather to the Vniuersitie of Oxford, at the tyme of his first founding the practice of musick there.’ The chief part of this list is divided into eight classes, which show that besides printed English music of his older contemporaries Heather had collected works by Frescobaldi, Sweelinck, and Palestrina, and also possessed some of the anthologies published by Phalèse. He owned some theoretical manuscripts by Elway Bevin, and the now famous set of part-books² containing festal Masses by English composers of the early sixteenth century such as Aston, Fayrfax and Taverner.

Whether or not the grouping of the printed part-books was Heather’s own, it is most interesting bibliographically. For the manuscript list describes clearly the distinctive binding of each group—‘with russet covers and orringe culler strings’, ‘in white velame books with greene strings’, ‘in white velame covers, having blewe strings’ and so on. This suggests that there was a deliberate distinction of colour and material, for two probable purposes—to make each set easy to find on the shelf, and to prevent the books of any one set being confused after use with those of any other. If not Heather himself, someone associated with him showed a collector’s instinct in caring for his music. But we know that Heather insisted that his books, and the instruments which he bequeathed with them, be properly checked; for in the *Statuta antiqua Universitatis Oxoniensis*³ we read: ‘Lastlie I ordain that once every yeare the instruments bee viewed, and the bookes: and that neyther of these be lent abroad upon any pretence whatsoever, nor removed out of the Schoole and place appointed.’

There is no Cambridge counterpart to William Heather. But John Cosin,

¹ Bodleian, MS. Mus. Sch. c. 204*.

² Now known as the Forrest–Heather part-books (Bodleian, MSS. Mus. Sch. e. 376–81) from the name of William Forrest, Chaplain to Queen Mary, who added the last seven Masses in the books.

³ Ed. Strickland Gibson (Oxford, 1931), p. 556.

Stuarts and Georgians to 1799

Bishop of Durham from 1660 to 1672, and Master of Peterhouse from 1634 to 1644 and again in 1660, deserves at least an honourable mention, if not a *proxime accessit*. For he was a great bibliophile, and was also interested in music. It is recorded that the copy of Bill's *Book of Common Prayer* (1634) now in Peterhouse Library was interleaved with musical settings written at his request for use in the Chapel.¹ He had musical friends, who gave an organ 'that the scholars might practise music in the Parlour'.² It also seems certain that Cosin brought with him from Durham (where he was a prebendary before his election to Peterhouse) some of the music in the Peterhouse part-books.³ It is at least possible that he caused to be brought together the other music (principally from Henry VIII's time) in these books, which are the slightly later equivalent of the Forrest–Heather books. Cosin may then be regarded as a likely begetter of a small collection of great importance, even if he did not assemble all of it himself.⁴

Collectors of this period were to be found not solely in academic circles, but also among the country gentlemen. Edward Paston (1550–1630), second son of Sir Thomas Paston, was a man noted for his musicianship and his skill in the liberal sciences. From his will we know that he possessed a substantial collection of music, including 'lute bookes prickt in ciphers after the Spanish and Italian fashion, and some in A.B.C. accordinge to the English fashion. . . bound in very good bookes'. Some had voice-parts attached. He also had printed and manuscript books 'of lattin, ffrench and Italian songs, some of three, foure, five, six, seaven, and eight parts'. Some idea of the large size of his collection can be gleaned from the fact that it was stored in three different places in his house—a chest, a closet, and 'fower truncks'.⁵

¹ See T. A. Walker, *Peterhouse* (Cambridge, 1935), p. 70 n. 1.

² See Walker, *ibid.* p. 57.

³ See Dom Anselm Hughes, *Catalogue of the Musical Manuscripts at Peterhouse, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1953), pp. x–xii. See also Walker, *op. cit.* pp. 128, 131; Peter le Huray, 'Towards a definitive Study of Pre-Restoration Anglican Service Music', *Musica Disciplina*, vol. xiv (1960), p. 180.

⁴ Le Huray, *op. cit.* pp. 181–5, points out that, a little later than Cosin, Henry May, a Fellow of Pembroke College, Cambridge, caused a similar collection of church music to be assembled for that College.

⁵ For further details see Philip Brett, 'The English Consort Song', *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association*, session 88 (1961–2), pp. 83–5. Three of the lute books (B.M. Add. MS. 31992, R.C.M. MS. 2089, and Tenbury MS. 340) and one set of part-books (Tenbury MSS. 341–4) have survived. (Two of these are possibly those found as lot 516 in the catalogue of the Williams sale of 1821.) Brett alludes to other possible survivals of Paston manuscripts.

Some British Collectors of Music

Another important collector of this period was Thomas Hamond (d. 1662) of Hawksdon, near Bury St Edmunds, whose manuscript music, mostly copied between 1631 and 1656, is fortunately preserved almost complete in the Wight Collection in the Bodleian. As Margaret Crum has described it in an admirable article,¹ I need only say here that Hamond's interest in music extended from as far back as Tallis up to his own contemporaries, such as Tomkins. Hamond also owned a few manuscripts now in the British Museum. (Pl. I a.) There were certainly other collectors in the earlier part of the seventeenth century (for instance, the Filmer family: see p. 89), but they are at present shadowy figures, and it is only with the emergence of John Evelyn, Samuel Pepys and Thomas Britton that the variety of our pageant grows apace and the horizons of collecting begin to expand.

From his diary we know that Evelyn was all his life a keen amateur of music, more perhaps as an observer and listener than as a player. None of his biographers seems to mention the fact that he owned a small but choice collection of music, of which his autograph catalogue is extant in the Evelyn Collection at Christ Church (*Catalogus Evelynianus 1687*, MS. 20^a, p. 190). It comprises twenty-nine items, mostly printed Italian madrigals of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century, and including also some interesting manuscripts and theory. Among the former were 'Recitativas from ye Opera at Venice 1646' and 'some excellent compositions of ye great masters of the Opera at Venice 1646', both presumably acquired, as may have been some of the printed music, during Evelyn's travels.

It is Evelyn's diary that gives us information about an otherwise unknown collection, which met an unusual fate. The entry for 25 November 1695 mentions the scientist and inventor Sir Samuel Moreland, and states: 'He had newly buried 200 pounds worth of music books as he sayd. 6 foote under grounde, as being love songs and vanity.' In the event, Moreland buried his music books not long before he himself was buried, for he died on 30 December 1695. It is perhaps worth noting that Evelyn owned a copy

¹ 'A Seventeenth Century Collection of Music belonging to Thomas Hamond, a Suffolk Landowner', *The Bodleian Library Record* (Oct. 1957), vol. vi, no. 1, pp. 373–86.